

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Amendment to the Claims**

The preambles of the independent claims recite “a wireless extension of the Centrex line,” while the bodies of those claims recite “a wireless communication device associated with the Centrex line.” To clarify the claims and make the bodies of the claims consistent with the preamble of the claims, Applicants have amended the independent claims to replace “a wireless communication device associated with the Centrex line” with “a wireless extension of the Centrex line.” The appropriate dependent claims have been amended accordingly. Applicants have also amended the independent claims to make explicit what is implicit in the term “wireless extension of the Centrex line.” As discussed in Applicants’ specification, a wireless extension of a Centrex line provides extension dialing when the wireless extension is within a limited service area defined for a Centrex customer premises area. In accordance with this description, Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite “wherein the wireless extension of the Centrex line provides extension dialing when the wireless extension of the Centrex line is within a limited service area defined for a Centrex customer premises area.”

### **II. The Proposed Combination Does Not Teach a Wireless Extension of a Centrex Line**

In the Office Action, all of the claims were rejected in view of the proposed combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,864 to O’Neil et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,411,682 to Fuller et al. As admitted in the Office Action, O’Neil et al. does not teach a Centrex line. In an attempt to cure this deficiency, it was noted that col. 11, lines 17-23 provides the motivation to combine O’Neil

et al. with Fuller et al. However, even when combined, the proposed combination does not teach a wireless extension of a Centrex line, as recited in the independent claims.<sup>1</sup>

Col. 11, lines 14-23 in O'Neil et al. states that the invention described in O'Neil et al. can be implemented with devices other than terminating telephones 20e and 20f, which are telephones served by the same subscriber line from an end office and have the same telephone number. The paragraph goes on to say that a direct-inward-dialing (DID) system can be used, and that statement was used as motivation of using the Centrex DID system disclosed in Fuller et al. However, this modification merely results in the terminating telephones 20e and 20f in O'Neil et al. become landline extensions of a Centrex line — not in the wireless telephone 34 becoming a wireless extension of a Centrex line. There is no teaching or suggestion in O'Neil et al. that the wireless telephone 34 is or can be modified to be a wireless extension of a Centrex line, and the above-quoted passage in O'Neil et al. used as motivation to use a Centrex wire line was presented before the wireless telephone 34 was even introduced in the discussion. Accordingly, it is clear that the above-quoted passage was only referring to the terminating telephones 20e and 20f and not to the wireless telephone 34. Further, there is no teaching in the cited passages in Fuller et al. of a wireless extension of a Centrex line that provides extension dialing when the wireless extension of the Centrex line is within a limited service area defined for a Centrex customer premises area. Accordingly, the proposed combination of O'Neil et al. and Fuller et al. fails to teach a wireless extension of a Centrex line that provides extension dialing when the wireless extension of the Centrex line is within a limited service area defined for a Centrex customer premises area, as recited in the claims.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants reserve the right to present argument at a later time as to why one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine O'Neil and Fuller.

### **III. Request for Initialed 1449 Form**

Applicants note that they have not yet received an initialed copy of the 1449 Form that accompanied the First Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement mailed September 21, 2001. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner initial this form and send a copy of the initialed form to Applicants along with the next communication. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants have included a copy of the 1449 Form at Tab A.

### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Amendment, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4719.

Dated: September 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



---

Joseph F. Herz

Reg. No. 41,070

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER  
GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4719